

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are rejected. Claim 12 is objected to.

37 CFR 1.83(a) Objections

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing "an approximately smooth surface to accept a pressure type bushing for coupling the conduit or pipe to the pipe-fitting surface when the knockout plug is removed." (Office Action at p. 2). Applicant encloses corrected drawing sheets with this paper and respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

Also, in support of the "approximately smooth surface to accept a pressure type bushing," applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to the specification, page 6, line 30-34: "A pipe-fitting surface 160 is formed adjacent to and approximately coaxial with the enclosure sealing and fitting surfaces (150, 140) and is **either generally smooth or, preferably, a tapered-threaded surface** with threads defined by ANSI B2.1-1968..." (Office Action at p. 2; Application at p.6, lines 30 - 34) (emphasis added).

Claim Objections

Claims 15-24 are objected to for misnumbering and were renumbered as 14-23 by the Examiner. As requested by the Examiner, the applicant shall refer to the claims by their new claim numbers only throughout this paper.

Claim 16, lines 7-8 was objected to for the second occurrence of "a seal." The applicant has amended claim 16

to recite "the seal" to overcome the objection and removal of the objection is requested.

35 USC § 102(b) (Claims 1-11 and 13-23)

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Previdi et al. (EP 0514861). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner refers the applicant to FIG. 2 for anticipation of an interference fit between the electrical enclosure (8) and knockout plug (1). **In response, the applicant expressly disclaims the use of a threaded seat to couple the knockout plug to the electrical enclosure in all claims.** More importantly, the applicant respectfully asserts that Previdi teaches neither the use of an interference fit as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art nor the use of a "knockout" plug. The Previdi reference teaches use of a threaded seat for a cap. While the applicant observes that there is certainly an elastic inter-relation of the cap and enclosure surfaces that resists rotation of the cap due to friction, there is no indication that the threaded seat is of an interference-fit design. Additionally, the cap in Previdi is not "knocked" out, but is unscrewed from the electrical enclosure. Throughout the applicant's claims, the word "knockout" is descriptive of how the plug may be removed from the electrical enclosure without a screwing motion (it may be knocked out). Based on the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding independent claim 10, the Examiner refers the applicant to FIG. 2 for anticipation of "a knockout

plug" having "an interference surface." As respectfully asserted for claim 1, above, the Previdi reference teaches neither the use of an interference surface nor a knockout plug. The applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 based on that fact.

Regarding claim 14 and as asserted for independent claims 1 and 10, the Previdi reference does not disclose use of an interference fit between a knockout plug (as described above) and the knockout. Based on this fact, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 14.

Regarding independent claim 16, both a "fitting surface" and "pipe-fitting surface" are claimed as separate elements on the electrical enclosure "to receive... a knockout plug" and "to accept a conduit," respectively. (Claim 16) Previdi teaches a surface on the electrical enclosure to receive the connector 1, but does not teach a surface to receive the conduit 30. The connector 1 receives the conduit 30 in the Previdi reference. Unlike the Previdi reference, the applicant's enclosure has both surfaces (as claimed in Claim 16). Based on this fact, the applicant respectfully asserts that Previdi does not anticipate claim 16 and requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1, claims 11 and 13 depend from independent claim 10, claim 15 depends from independent claim 14 and claims 17-23 depend from independent claim 16. At least for the reasons asserted for the independent claims, the applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to dependent claims 2-9, 11, 13, 15 and 17-23.

Application No. 10/696,336
Amdt. Dated October 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2004


Claim 12 was objected to as being dependent upon rejected independent claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to claim 12 based at least on the above assertions for claim 10.

CONCLUSION

The applicant believes that claims 1-23 are now in a condition for allowance. A notice of allowance is respectfully requested at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2004


James K. Dawson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,701

KOPPEL JACOBS PATRICK & HEYBL
555 St. Charles Drive, Suite #107
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360
(805) 373-0060
101-27-018.Amendment

Application No. 10/696,336
Amdt. Dated October 26, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 28, 2004

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheets for FIGS. 1, 2, 3A, 3B and 4 are included with this paper.